

Case Number: 2006-0459-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Folder Title:

Campaign-Foreign Policy Speeches

Staff Office-Individual:

Speechwriting-Blinken

Original OA/ID Number:

3384

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
48	5	11	2	V

A NEW COVENANT FOR AMERICAN SECURITY

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C.
DECEMBER 12, 1991

I was born nearly half a century ago at the dawn of the Cold War, a time of great change, enormous opportunity and uncertain peril. At a time when Americans wanted nothing more than to come home and resume lives of peace and quiet, our country had to summon the will for a new kind of war — containing an expansionist and hostile Soviet Union which vowed to bury us. We had to find ways to rebuild the economies of Europe and Asia, encourage a worldwide movement toward independence and vindicate our nation's principles in the world against yet another totalitarian challenge to liberal democracy.

Thanks to the unstinting courage and sacrifice of the American people, we were able to win that Cold War. Now we've entered a new era, and we need a new vision and the strength to meet a new set of opportunities and threats. We face the same challenge today that we faced in 1946 — to build a world of security, freedom, democracy, free markets and growth at a time of great change.

Anyone running for President right now — Republican or Democrat — is going to have to provide a vision for security in this new era. That is what I hope to do today.

Given the problems we face at home, we do have to take care of our own people and their needs first. We need to remember the central lesson of the collapse of communism and the Soviet Union. We never defeated them on the field of battle. The Soviet Union collapsed from the inside out — from economic, political and spiritual failure.

Make no mistake: Foreign and domestic policy are inseparable in today's world. If we're not strong at home we can't lead the world we've done so much to make. And if we withdraw from the world, it will hurt us economically at home.

We can't allow this false choice between domestic policy and foreign policy to hurt our country and our economy. Our President has devoted his time and energy to foreign concerns and ignored dire problems here at home. As a result, we're drifting in the longest economic slump since World War II, and, in reaction to that, elements in both parties now want America to respond to the collapse of communism and a crippling recession at home by retreating from the world.

I have agreed with President Bush on a number of foreign policy questions. I supported his efforts to kick Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. I think he did a masterful job in pulling together the victorious multi-lateral coalition. I support his desire to pursue peace talks in the Middle East. I agree with the President that we can't turn our back on NATO. And I supported giving the administration fast-track authority to negotiate a sound and fair free trade agreement with Mexico.

But because the President seems to favor political stability and his personal relations with foreign leaders over a coherent policy of promoting freedom, democracy and economic growth, he often does things I disagree with. For example, his close personal ties with foreign leaders helped forge the coalition against Saddam Hussein, but also led him to side with China's communist rulers after the democratic uprising of students. The President forced Iraq out of Kuwait, but as soon as the war was over, he seemed so concerned with the stability of the area that he was willing to leave the Kurds to an awful fate. He is rightfully seeking peace in the Middle East, but his urge to personally broker a deal has led him to take public positions which may undermine the ability of the Israelis and the Arabs to agree on an enduring peace.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, we need a President who

"The defense of freedom and the promotion of democracy around the world aren't merely a reflection of our deepest values; they are vital to our national interests."

objectives: First, we must restructure our military forces for a new era. Second, we must work with our allies to encourage the spread and consolidation of democracy abroad. And third, we must reestablish America's economic leadership at home and in the world.

When Americans elect a President, they select a Commander in Chief. They want someone they can trust to act when our country's interests are threatened. To protect our interests and our values, sometimes we have to stand and fight. That is why, as President, I pledge to maintain military forces strong enough to deter and when necessary to defeat any threat to our essential interests.

Today's defense debate centers too narrowly on the size of the military budget. But the real questions are, what threats do we face, what forces do we need to counter them, and how must we change?

We can and must substantially reduce our military forces and spending, because the Soviet threat is decreasing and our allies are able to and should shoulder more of the defense burden. But we still must set the level of our defense spending based on what we need to protect our interests. First let's provide for a strong defense. Then we can talk about defense savings.

At the outset of this discussion, I want to make one thing clear: The world is still rapidly changing. The world we look out on today is not the same world we will see tomorrow. We need to be ready to adjust our defense projections to meet threats that could be either heightened or reduced down the road.

Our defense needs were clearer during the Cold War, when it was widely accepted that we needed enough forces to deter a Soviet nuclear attack, to defend against a Soviet-led conventional offensive in Europe and to protect other American interests, especially in Northeast Asia and the Persian Gulf. The collapse of the Soviet Union shattered that consensus, leaving us without a clear benchmark for determining the size or mix of our armed forces.

However, a new consensus is emerging on the nature of post-Cold War security. It assumes that the gravest threats we are most likely to face in the years ahead include:

- First, the spread of deprivation and disorder in the former Soviet Union, which could lead to armed conflict among the republics or the rise of a fervently nationalistic and aggressive regime in Russia still in possession of long-range nuclear weapons.

- Second, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological, as well as the means for delivering them.

- Third, enduring tensions in various regions, especially the Korean peninsula and the Middle East and the attendant risks of terrorist attacks on Americans traveling or working overseas.

- And finally, the growing intensity of ethnic rivalry and separatist violence within national borders, such as we have seen in Yugoslavia, India and elsewhere, that could spill beyond those borders.

To deal with these new threats, we need to replace our Cold War military structure with a smaller, more flexible mix of capabilities, including:

- **Nuclear deterrence.** We can dramatically reduce our nuclear arsenals through negotiations and other reciprocal actions. But as an irreducible minimum, we must retain a survivable nuclear force to deter any conceivable threat.

- **Rapid deployment.** We need a force capable of projecting power quickly when and where it's needed. This means the Army must develop a more mobile mix of mechanized and armored forces. The Air Force should emphasize tactical air power and airlift, and the Navy and Marine Corps must maintain sufficient carrier and

"No national security issue is more urgent than the question of who will control the nuclear weapons and technology of the former Soviet empire."

objectives: First, we must restructure our military forces for a new era. Second, we must work with our allies to encourage the spread and consolidation of democracy abroad. And third, we must reestablish America's economic leadership at home and in the world.

When Americans elect a President, they select a Commander in Chief. They want someone they can trust to act when our country's interests are threatened. To protect our interests and our values, sometimes we have to stand and fight. That is why, as President, I pledge to maintain military forces strong enough to deter and when necessary to defeat any threat to our essential interests.

Today's defense debate centers too narrowly on the size of the military budget. But the real questions are, what threats do we face, what forces do we need to counter them, and how must we change?

We can and must substantially reduce our military forces and spending, because the Soviet threat is decreasing and our allies are able to and should shoulder more of the defense burden. But we still must set the level of our defense spending based on what we need to protect our interests. First let's provide for a strong defense. Then we can talk about defense savings.

At the outset of this discussion, I want to make one thing clear: The world is still rapidly changing. The world we look out on today is not the same world we will see tomorrow. We need to be ready to adjust our defense projections to meet threats that could be either heightened or reduced down the road.

Our defense needs were clearer during the Cold War, when it was widely accepted that we needed enough forces to deter a Soviet nuclear attack, to defend against a Soviet-led conventional offensive in Europe and to protect other American interests, especially in Northeast Asia and the Persian Gulf. The collapse of the Soviet Union shattered that consensus, leaving us without a clear benchmark for determining the size or mix of our armed forces.

However, a new consensus is emerging on the nature of post-Cold War security. It assumes that the gravest threats we are most likely to face in the years ahead include:

- First, the spread of deprivation and disorder in the former Soviet Union, which could lead to armed conflict among the republics or the rise of a fervently nationalistic and aggressive regime in Russia still in possession of long-range nuclear weapons.

- Second, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological, as well as the means for delivering them.

- Third, enduring tensions in various regions, especially the Korean peninsula and the Middle East and the attendant risks of terrorist attacks on Americans traveling or working overseas.

- And finally, the growing intensity of ethnic rivalry and separatist violence within national borders, such as we have seen in Yugoslavia, India and elsewhere, that could spill beyond those borders.

To deal with these new threats, we need to replace our Cold War military structure with a smaller, more flexible mix of capabilities, including:

- **Nuclear deterrence.** We can dramatically reduce our nuclear arsenals through negotiations and other reciprocal actions. But as an irreducible minimum, we must retain a survivable nuclear force to deter any conceivable threat.

- **Rapid deployment.** We need a force capable of projecting power quickly when and where it's needed. This means the Army must develop a more mobile mix of mechanized and armored forces. The Air Force should emphasize tactical air power and airlift, and the Navy and Marine Corps must maintain sufficient carrier and

"Without growth abroad, our own economy cannot thrive."

notification and help communities plan for a transition from a defense to a domestic economy. Thirty-one percent of our graduate engineers work for the defense industry. They and other highly skilled workers and technicians are a vital national resource at a time when our technological edge in a world economy must be sharper than ever before. I have called for a new advanced research agency — a civilian DARPA — that could help capture for commercial work the brilliance of scientists and engineers who have accomplished wonders on the battlefield.

Likewise, those who have served the nation in uniform cannot be dumped on the job market. We've got to enlist them to help meet our many needs at home. By shifting people from active duty to the National Guard and reserves, offering early retirement options, limiting re-enlistment and slowing the pace of recruitment, we can build down our forces in a gradual way that doesn't abandon people of proven commitment and competence.

Our people in uniform are among the most highly skilled in the areas we need most. We need to transfer those human resources into our workforce and even into our schools, perhaps in part by using reserve centers and closed bases for community-based education and training programs.

The defense policy I have outlined keeps America strong and still yields substantial savings. The American people have earned this peace dividend through forty years of unrelenting vigilance and sacrifice and an investment of trillions of dollars. And they are entitled to have the dividend reinvested in their future.

Finally, America needs to reach a new agreement with our allies for sharing the costs and risks of maintaining peace. While Desert Storm set a useful precedent for cost-sharing, our forces still did most of the fighting and dying. We need to shift that burden to a wider coalition of nations of which America will be a part. In the Persian Gulf, in Namibia, in Cambodia and elsewhere in recent years, the United Nations has begun to play the role that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman envisioned for it. We must take the lead now in making their vision real — by expanding the Security Council and making Germany and Japan permanent members; by continuing to press for greater efficiency in U.N. administration; and by exploring ways to institutionalize the U.N.'s success in mobilizing international participation in Desert Storm.

One proposal worth exploring calls for a U.N. Rapid Deployment Force that could be used for purposes beyond traditional peacekeeping, such as standing guard at the borders of countries threatened by aggression; preventing attacks on civilians; providing humanitarian relief; and combatting terrorism and drug trafficking.

In Europe, new security arrangements will evolve over the next decade. While insisting on a fairer sharing of the common defense burden, we must not turn our back on NATO. Until a more effective security system emerges, we must give our allies no reason to doubt our constancy.

As we restructure our military forces, we must reinforce the powerful global movement toward democracy.

U.S. foreign policy cannot be divorced from the moral principles most Americans share. We cannot disregard how other governments treat their own people, whether their domestic institutions are democratic or repressive, whether they help encourage or check illegal conduct beyond their borders. This does not mean we should deal only with democracies or that we should try to remake the world in our image. But recent experience from Panama to Iran to Iraq shows the dangers of forging strategic relationships with despotic regimes.

"We must be strong at home to lead and maintain global growth."

notification and help communities plan for a transition from a defense to a domestic economy. Thirty-one percent of our graduate engineers work for the defense industry. They and other highly skilled workers and technicians are a vital national resource at a time when our technological edge in a world economy must be sharper than ever before. I have called for a new advanced research agency — a civilian DARPA — that could help capture for commercial work the brilliance of scientists and engineers who have accomplished wonders on the battlefield.

Likewise, those who have served the nation in uniform cannot be dumped on the job market. We've got to enlist them to help meet our many needs at home. By shifting people from active duty to the National Guard and reserves, offering early retirement options, limiting re-enlistment and slowing the pace of recruitment, we can build down our forces in a gradual way that doesn't abandon people of proven commitment and competence.

Our people in uniform are among the most highly skilled in the areas we need most. We need to transfer those human resources into our workforce and even into our schools, perhaps in part by using reserve centers and closed bases for community-based education and training programs.

The defense policy I have outlined keeps America strong and still yields substantial savings. The American people have earned this peace dividend through forty years of unrelenting vigilance and sacrifice and an investment of trillions of dollars. And they are entitled to have the dividend reinvested in their future.

Finally, America needs to reach a new agreement with our allies for sharing the costs and risks of maintaining peace. While Desert Storm set a useful precedent for cost-sharing, our forces still did most of the fighting and dying. We need to shift that burden to a wider coalition of nations of which America will be a part. In the Persian Gulf, in Namibia, in Cambodia and elsewhere in recent years, the United Nations has begun to play the role that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman envisioned for it. We must take the lead now in making their vision real — by expanding the Security Council and making Germany and Japan permanent members; by continuing to press for greater efficiency in U.N. administration; and by exploring ways to institutionalize the U.N.'s success in mobilizing international participation in Desert Storm.

One proposal worth exploring calls for a U.N. Rapid Deployment Force that could be used for purposes beyond traditional peacekeeping, such as standing guard at the borders of countries threatened by aggression; preventing attacks on civilians; providing humanitarian relief; and combatting terrorism and drug trafficking.

In Europe, new security arrangements will evolve over the next decade. While insisting on a fairer sharing of the common defense burden, we must not turn our back on NATO. Until a more effective security system emerges, we must give our allies no reason to doubt our constancy.

As we restructure our military forces, we must reinforce the powerful global movement toward democracy.

U.S. foreign policy cannot be divorced from the moral principles most Americans share. We cannot disregard how other governments treat their own people, whether their domestic institutions are democratic or repressive, whether they help encourage or check illegal conduct beyond their borders. This does not mean we should deal only with democracies or that we should try to remake the world in our image. But recent experience from Panama to Iran to Iraq shows the dangers of forging strategic relationships with despotic regimes.

It should matter to us how others govern themselves. Democracies don't go to war with each other. The French and British have nuclear weapons, but we don't fear annihilation at their hands. Democracies don't sponsor terrorist acts against each other. They are more likely to be reliable trading partners, protect the global environment and abide by international law.

Over time, democracy is a stabilizing force. It provides non-violent means for resolving disputes. Democracies do a better job of protecting ethnic, religious and other minorities. And elections can help resolve fratricidal civil wars.

Yet President Bush too often has hesitated when democratic forces needed our support in challenging the status quo. I believe the President erred when he secretly rushed envoys to resume cordial relations with China barely a month after the massacre in Tiananmen Square; when he spurned Yeltsin before the Moscow coup; when he poured cold water on the Baltic and Ukrainian aspirations for self-determination and independence; and when he initially refused to help the Kurds.

The administration continues to coddle China, despite its continuing crackdown on democratic reforms, its brutal subjugation of Tibet, its irresponsible exports of nuclear and missile technology, its support for the homicidal Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, and its abusive trade practices. Such forbearance on our part might have made sense during the Cold War, when China was a counterweight to Soviet power. But it makes no sense to play the China card now, when our opponents have thrown in their hand.

In the Middle East, the administration deserves credit for bringing Israel and its Arab antagonists to the negotiating table. Yet I believe the President is wrong to use public pressure tactics against Israel. In the process, he has raised Arab expectations that he'll deliver Israeli concessions and fed Israeli fears that its interests will be sacrificed to an American-imposed solution.

We must remember that even if the Arab-Israeli dispute were resolved tomorrow, there would still be ample causes of conflict in the Middle East: ancient tribal, ethnic and religious hatreds; control of oil and water; the bitterness of the have-nots toward those who have; the lack of democratic institutions to hold leaders accountable to their people and restrain their actions abroad; and the territorial ambitions of Iraq and Syria. We have paid a terrible price for the administration's earlier policies of deference to Saddam Hussein. Today, we must deal with Hafez Assad in Syria, but we must not overlook his tyrannical rule and domination of Lebanon.

We need a broader policy toward the Middle East that seeks to limit the flow of arms into the region, as well as the materials needed to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction; promotes democracy and human rights; and preserves our strategic relationship with the one democracy in the region: Israel.

And in Africa as well, we must align America with the rising tide of democracy. The administration has claimed credit for the historic opening to democracy now being negotiated in South Africa, when in fact it resisted the sanctions policy that helped make this hopeful moment possible.

Today, we should concentrate our attention on doing what we can to help end the violence that has ravaged the South African townships, by supporting with our aid the local structures that seek to mediate these disputes and by insisting that the South African government show the same zeal in prosecuting the perpetrators of the violence as it did in the past when pursuing the leaders of the anti-apartheid movement. The administration and our states and cities should only relax our remaining sanctions as it becomes clearer that the day of democracy and guaranteed individual rights is at hand. And when that day does dawn, we must be prepared to

extend our assistance to make sure that democracy, once gained, is not lost there.

An American foreign policy of engagement for democracy will unite our interests and our values. Here's what we should do:

- First, we need to respond more forcefully to one of the greatest security challenges of our time, to help the people of the former Soviet empire demilitarize their societies and build free political and economic institutions. Congress has passed \$500 million to help the Soviets destroy nuclear weapons, and for humanitarian aid. We can do better. As Senator Sam Nunn and Representative Les Aspin have argued, we should shift money from marginal military programs to this key investment in our future security. We can radically reduce the threat of nuclear destruction that has dogged us for decades by investing a fraction of what would otherwise have to be spent to counter that threat. And, together with our G-7 partners, we can supply the Soviet republics with the food and medical aid they need to survive their first winter of freedom in 74 years. We should do all that we can to coordinate aid efforts with our allies, and to provide the best technical assistance we can to distribute that food and aid.

No national security issue is more urgent than the question of who will control the nuclear weapons and technology of the former Soviet empire. Those weapons pose a threat to the security of every American, to our allies, and to the republics themselves.

I know it may be bad politics to be for any aid program. But we owe it to the people who defeated communism, the people who defeated the coup. And we owe it to ourselves. A small amount spent stabilizing the emerging democracies in the former Soviet empire today will reduce by much more the money we may have to commit to our defense in the future. And it will lead to the creation of lucrative new markets which mean new American jobs. Having won the Cold War, we must not now lose the peace.

- We should recognize Ukraine's independence, as well as that of other republics who make that decision democratically. But we should link U.S. and western non-humanitarian aid to agreements by the republics to abide by all arms agreements negotiated by Soviet authorities, demonstrate responsibility with regard to nuclear weapons, demilitarize their economies, respect minority rights, and proceed with market and political reforms.

- We should use our diplomatic and economic leverage to increase the material incentives to democratize and raise the costs for those who won't. We have every right to condition our foreign aid and debt relief policies on demonstrable progress toward democracy and market reforms. In extreme cases, such as that of China, we should condition favorable trade terms on political liberalization and responsible international conduct.

- We need to support evolving institutional structures favorable to countries struggling with the transition to democracy and markets, such as the new European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, whose mission is to rebuild the societies of Central and Eastern Europe. We are right to encourage the European Community to open its doors to those societies, perhaps by creating an affiliate status that carries some but not all of the privileges of membership.

- We should encourage private American investment in the former Soviet empire. The Soviet republics, after all, are rich in human and natural resources. One day, they and Eastern Europe could be lucrative markets for us.

- We should regard increased funding for democratic assistance as a legitimate part of our national security budget. We should support groups like the National Endowment for Democracy, which work openly rather than covertly to

"We must devise and pursue national policies that serve the needs of our people by uniting us at home and restoring America's greatness in the world."

promote democratic pluralism and free markets abroad. I would encourage both the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency to channel more of their resources to promoting democracy. And just as Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America helped bring the truth to the people of those societies, we should create a Radio Free Asia to carry news and hope to China and elsewhere.

• Finally, just as President Kennedy launched the Peace Corps 30 years ago, we should create a Democracy Corps today that will send thousands of talented American volunteers to countries that need their legal, financial and political expertise.

Our second major strategic challenge is to help lead the world into a new era of global growth. Any governor who's tried to create jobs over the last decade know that experience in international economics is essential and that success in the global economy must be at the core of national security in the 1990s.

Without growth abroad, our own economy cannot thrive. U.S. exports of goods and services will be over a half-trillion dollars in 1991 — and 10 percent of our economy. Without global growth, healthy international competition turns all too readily to economic warfare. Without growth and economic progress, there can be no true economic justice among or within nations.

I believe the negotiations on an open trading system in the GATT are of extraordinary importance. And I support the negotiation of a North American Free Trade Agreement, so long as it's fair to American farmers and workers, protects the environment and observes decent labor standards.

Freer trade abroad means more jobs at home. Every \$1 billion in U.S. exports generates 20,000 to 30,000 more jobs. We must find ways to help developing nations finally overcome their debt crisis, which has lessened their capacity to buy American goods and probably cost us 1.5 million American jobs.

We must be strong at home to lead and maintain global growth. Our weakness at home has caused even our economic competitors to worry about our stubborn refusal to establish a national economic strategy that will regain our economic leadership and restore opportunity for the middle class.

How can we lead when we have gone from being the world's largest creditor country to the world's largest debtor nation — now owing the world \$405 billion? When we depend on foreigners for \$100 billion a year of financing, we're not the masters of our own destiny.

I spoke in my last lecture about how we must rebuild our nation's economic greatness, for the job of restoring America's competitive edge truly begins at home. I have offered a program to build the most well-educated and well-trained workforce in the world and put our national budget to work on programs that make America richer, not more indebted.

Our economic strength must become a central defining element of our national security policy. We must organize to compete and win in the global economy. We need a commitment from American business and labor to work together to make world-class products. We must be prepared to exchange some short-term benefits — whether in the quarterly profit statement or in archaic work rules — for long-term success.

The private sector must maintain the initiative, but government has an indispensable role. A recent Department of Commerce report is a wake-up call that we are falling behind our major competitors in Europe and Japan on emerging technologies that will define the high-paying jobs of the future — like advanced materials, biotechnology, superconductors and computer-integrated manufacturing.

I have mentioned a civilian advanced research projects agency to

"We should use our diplomatic and economic leverage to increase the material incentives to democratize and raise the costs for those who won't."

work closely with the private sector, so that its priorities are not set by government alone. We have hundreds of national laboratories with extraordinary talent that have put the United States at the forefront of military technology. We need to reorient their mission, working with private companies and universities, to advance technologies that will make our lives better and create tomorrow's jobs.

Not enough of our companies engage in export — just 15 percent of our companies account for 85 percent of our exports. We have to meet our competitors' efforts to help smaller- and medium-sized businesses identify and gain foreign markets.

And most important, government must assure that international competition is fair by insisting to our European, Japanese and other trading partners that if they won't play by the rules of an open trading system, then we will play by theirs.

We have no more important bilateral relationships than our alliance with Japan, a relationship that has matured from one of dependency in the 1950s to one of partnership today. Our relationship is based on ties of democracy, but as we cooperate, we also compete. And the maturity of our relationship allows American Presidents, as I will, to insist on fair play. As we put our own economic house in order, Japan must open the doors of its economic house, or our partnership will be imperiled with consequences for all the world.

Now we must understand, as we never have before, that our national security is largely economic. The success of our engagement in the world depends not on the headlines it brings to Washington politicians, but on the benefits it brings to hard-working middle-class Americans. Our "foreign" policies are not really foreign at all.

When greenhouse gas emissions from developed nations warm the atmosphere and CFCs eat away at the ozone layer, our beaches and farmlands and people are threatened. When drugs flood into our country from South America and Asia, our cities suffer and our children are put at risk. When a Libyan terrorist can go to an airport in Europe and check a bomb in a suitcase that kills hundreds of people, our freedom is diminished and our people live in fear.

So let us no longer define national security in the narrow military terms of the Cold War. We can no longer afford to have foreign and domestic policies. We must devise and pursue national policies that serve the needs of our people by uniting us at home and restoring America's greatness in the world. To lead abroad, a President of the United States must first lead at home.

Half a century ago, this country emerged victorious from an all-consuming war into a new era of great challenge. It was a time of change, a time for new thinking, a time for working together to build a free and prosperous world, a time for putting that war behind us. In the aftermath of that war, President Harry Truman and his successors forged a bipartisan consensus in America that brought security and prosperity for 20 years.

Today we need a President, a public and a policy that are not caught up in the wars of the past — not World War II, not Vietnam, not the Cold War. What we need to elect in 1992 is not the last President of the 20th century but the first President of the 21st century.

This spring, when the troops came home from the Persian Gulf, we had over 100,000 people at a welcome home parade in Little Rock. Veterans came from all across the state — not just those who had just returned from the Gulf, but men and women who had served in World War II, Korea and Vietnam. I'll never forget how moved I was as I watched them march down the street to our cheers and saw the

Vietnam veterans finally being given the honor they deserved all along. The divisions we have lived with for the last two decades seemed to fade away amid the common outburst of triumph and gratitude.

That is the spirit we need as we move into this new era. As President Lincoln told Congress in another time of new challenge, in 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country. Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history."

Thank you very much.

"Even as the American Dream is inspiring people around the world, America is on the sidelines, a military giant crippled by economic weakness and an uncertain vision."

**REMARKS BY GOVERNOR BILL CLINTON
WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL
LOS ANGELES, CA
AUGUST 13, 1992**

Let me say how very glad I am to be here, and how appreciative I am for the opportunity to address you. I appreciate the introduction which Dick gave me. I always enjoy speaking to people who are concerned about world affairs. Ever since I left my native state for virtually the first time when I was eighteen to go off to the School of Foreign Services at Georgetown University, I have been profoundly concerned with the role of America in the world, and the impact of events around in the world on our nation, and the happenings within other countries, with which we should be concerned.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is always a hazardous enterprise to discuss foreign policy in the midst of a presidential election. I met yesterday in Washington with Prime Minister Rabin of Israel, and I assured him that I did not want anything that occurred in this campaign to interrupt the commitment of the United States of America to the peace process in the Middle East. I told him that I intended to support the continuity of that process for the next eighty-two days, and if victorious in this election, beyond. I feel that way about our efforts to maintain a united front in dealing with the crisis in Bosnia, and to stand firm in the face of Saddam Hussein's flaunting of the United Nation's cease-fire resolution in Iraq.

Nonetheless it is important that a candidate for President, especially in a time of great change, set forth his or her views, and distinguish them from the opponent. And that is what I will try to do here today.

We stand today blessed as the inheritors of a new world. It is a world of hope and opportunity, made possible by a half century of bipartisan leadership and unstinting sacrifice by the American people and our allies--and above all by the courage of the men and women, who lived in the formerly Communist countries of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. They tore down the walls of repression and stood down the tanks of tyranny. Now the Iron Curtain has collapsed, and the Cold War is over. We have cause for rejoicing.

But we must also pause and reflect about the new demands imposed on us by the new world we have done so much to create, and what kind of Presidential leadership this new world

demands of us, both at home and abroad. The world remains a place of peril. While the Soviet Union is gone, a president must still be ready to defy and to defeat those who threaten us. Whatever else we expect of our presidents, we still need a resolute leader who will wield America's might and marshal all our resources, and the resources of our allies, to defend our most fundamental interests.

And yet today there are new tests of leadership as well:

- The first is to grasp how the world we live in has changed.
- The second is to assert a vision for our role in this dynamic world.
- The third is to summon all our strengths -- our economic power, our values, and when necessary our military might -- in the service of our new vision.

I do not believe Mr. Bush has met these new tests, despite his clear effectiveness in organizing the allies against Iraq's aggression. Too often this administration has held on to old assumptions and old policies, trying to prop up yesterday's status quo, failing to confront our new challenges.

I have agreed with President Bush on a number of foreign policy issues. But I do not believe he has a complete vision of this new era. In a world of change, security flows from initiative, not from inertia.

Next week, the Republicans will gather in Houston to nominate Mr. Bush and praise his record. Will they paint a partisan portrait of the past, or render a vision of the future that we Americans can build together?

In their campaign, the Republicans already have tried to claim sole credit for the victory of freedom in the Cold War. And they suggest that in their second term they will bring to domestic policy the same energy and expertise marked by foreign policy in their first term.

Their argument misreads both history and current events. The notion that the Republicans won the Cold War reminds me of the rooster who took credit for the dawn. The truth is, from Truman to Kennedy to Carter, Democratic as well as Republican presidents held firm against the expansion of Communism; and from Richard Russell to Scoop Jackson to Sam Nunn, Democratic leaders in Congress helped build the finest defense forces in the history of the world.

But even more flawed is the Republican claim that, just as they changed the world in their first term, they will change America in their second. We must understand that foreign and domestic policy are two sides of the same coin. If we're not strong at home we can't be strong abroad. If we can't compete in the global economy, we'll pay for it at home.

The same president who refused to make changes as American wages fell from first to thirteenth in the developed world was slow to recognize the changes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The same Administration that did nothing as 10 million Americans lost their jobs due to tired, old economic policies also stood by as courageous Chinese students were attacked with tanks in Tiananmen Square.

I believe global change is inexorable and can work to our advantage or to our disadvantage, depending on what we do. No one understands the opportunities and hazards of change better than the people of California. Your commerce and culture stand as testaments to the benefits we derive from our engagement with Mexico, Japan, and the other nations of the Pacific. Your economy has been hurt by the lack of a national economic strategy, especially the lack of a plan to convert defense cuts into domestic economic investments.

Last December at Georgetown University and last April in New York, I outlined the role I see for America in this era of change. I marked the steps we must take to meet our new challenges: to reestablish America's economic leadership; foster the spread of democracy abroad; and revamp our Cold War military to meet our new security needs. Today I want to expand on what leadership in this new era requires, particularly in rethinking our security strategy and modernizing our defenses.

Leadership for a Strong Economy

In this new era, our first foreign priority and our first domestic priority are one and the same: reviving our economy. America must regain its economic strength to play a strong role as leader of the world. And we must have a president who attends to prosperity at home if our people are to sustain their support for engagement abroad. The world needs a strong America, and American strength begins right here.

This has been the administration's most glaring foreign policy failure. An anemic, debt-laden economy; the developed world's highest rates of crime and poverty; an archaic education system; decaying roads, ports, and cities: all these undermine our diplomacy, make it harder for us to secure favorable trade agreements and compromise our ability to finance essential military actions. Mr. Bush's economic neglect literally has invited foreign pity. You remember the Japanese trip, which ended with the Japanese Prime Minister saying he felt "sympathy" for the United States. He did not feel sympathy for us because of our military weakness; he felt sympathy for us because he thought we had refused to address our problems here at home, we had gone into a period of economic decline, and our best days might be behind us. It is time for economic leadership that inspires foreign respect, not pity.

The currency of national strength in this new era will be denominated not only in ships, tanks and planes, but also in diplomas, patents and paychecks. My first foreign policy priority will be to restore America's economic vitality. I have laid out a strategy to raise our peoples' skill levels, boost productivity, spur innovation and investment, reduce the national debt, and make us the world's strongest trading power. I will elevate economics in foreign policy; create an Economic Security Council similar to the National Security Council; and change the culture of the State Department so that economics is no longer a poor cousin to old-school diplomacy.

In a Clinton-Gore Administration, presidential leadership will mean mobilizing our country for the global economic competition that is the hallmark of this new age. It will mean securing commitments from American business and labor to take on new cooperative responsibilities. For there can be no growth without increased productivity in the private sector. In contrast to the United States, in all the high-growth countries, business and labor, government and education are working in harness on the same side to develop the capacities of all the people. Leadership will mean championing open world trade that benefits American workers as well as American businesses -- from the roaring markets of the Pacific Rim to the resurgent economies of Mexico and Latin America. And it will mean swift responses and stiff penalties to those who abuse the rules of trade once agreed upon.

One way we will strengthen our economy is through leadership for environmentally sound growth. President Bush, in my judgement, abdicated that leadership, before, during, and after the Rio Earth Summit. The Japanese and the Germans used the Rio Earth Summit as an opportunity relentlessly to attempt to sell environmental technology to all the other nations of

the world, while we were fighting the global warming treaty and the bio-diversity treaty, and claiming we couldn't meet the CO2 emission standards that the Europeans and the Japanese said they could meet. Maybe that's one reason that seventy percent of the American market in environmental technologies is now held by foreign firms, when it should be held by American companies. As we convert from defense and other technologies, we can create high-wage jobs for the twenty-first century by reconciling the goals of economic growth and environmental protection. That is why I've proposed a strategy to boost our country's energy efficiency and to use market-based incentives to prevent pollution before it's created. It's one reason I picked Al Gore to be my running mate. We want to put America back in the forefront of global efforts to achieve sustainable development, and in the process, leave our children a better world. And we believe -- and this is one decision that you have to make, you and all other Americans -- we believe that sound environmental policies are a pre-condition of economic growth, not a break on it. And that is one of the major decisions facing the American people in this election.

Leadership to Promote Democracy

The second imperative of presidential leadership in this new era is to reinforce the powerful global movement toward democracy and market economies. Our strategic interests and moral values both are rooted in this goal. As we help democracy expand, we make ourselves and our allies safer. Democracies rarely go to war with each other or traffic in terrorism. They make more reliable partners in trade and diplomacy. Growing market economies expand individual opportunity and social tolerance.

Yet Mr. Bush has been oddly reluctant to commit America's prestige on the side of people inspired by American precepts and example. When democratic reformers sought to break up the Soviet empire, Mr. Bush snubbed Boris Yeltsin, sided with the crumbling Soviet center, and failed to lead the call for aid to Russia until he was pushed into it by Richard Nixon and others.

When 50 million Ukrainians sought emancipation from a dying communist empire, Mr. Bush withheld moral support, and instead -- in Kiev itself -- publicly chided Ukraine's voices of independence for seeking a "suicidal nationalism."

When China cracked down on pro-democracy demonstrators, exported advanced weapons to radical regimes, and suppressed Tibet, Mr. Bush failed to stand up for our values. Instead, he sent secret emissaries to China, signalling that we would do business as usual with those who murdered freedom in Tiananmen Square.

And when it was clear to all that Yugoslavia inexorably was breaking apart, Mr. Bush and his Secretary of State gave short shrift to the yearnings of those seeking freedom in Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia, and ignored warning signs that Slobodan Milosevic was emerging as one of Europe's bloodiest tyrants.

From the Baltics to Beijing, from Sarajevo to South Africa, time after time, George Bush has sided with the status quo rather than democratic change -- with familiar tyrants rather than those who would overthrow them -- with the old geography of repression rather than a new map of freedom.

This pattern was most glaring in Mr. Bush's treatment of Iraq prior to its invasion of Kuwait, and his failure to support Saddam Hussein's opponents after the success of Desert Storm. I supported the President's effort to drive Saddam out of Kuwait, and I respect his

conduct of the war itself. But now we are learning how his administration appeased Saddam in the months prior to August, 1990. Even after the conclusion of the Iran-Iraq War, after Saddam had gassed his own Kurdish population, this administration continued to coddle Iraq with economic credits, licensed militarily useful technology, and offered an obliging silence about its savage human rights record. In keeping with the president's directive to woo Saddam, the State Department even wrote an apology after the Voice of America dared to criticize Iraq's tyrannical regime.

My Administration will stand up for democracy. We will support international assistance to emerging, fragile democracies in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and create a Democracy Corps to help them develop free institutions. We will keep the pressure on South Africa until the day of true democracy has dawned. We will stand by Israel -- our only democratic ally in the Middle East -- and press for more accountable governance throughout the region. We will work to make sure that weapons of mass destruction do not enter in the hands of tyrants, all too willing to use them. We will link China's trading privileges to its human rights record and its conduct on trade and weapons sales. We will create a Radio Free Asia, like the successful Radio Free Europe, to carry news and hope to freedom-loving people in China and elsewhere. We will buttress democratic forces in Haiti, Peru, and throughout the western hemisphere. And we will make the U.S. the catalyst for a collective stand against aggression, the action I have urged in response to Serbian aggression in Bosnia, one with which, thankfully, the Bush administration now agrees after first calling it reckless.

Leadership to Modernize America's Defenses

No test of presidential leadership is more important than the president's actions as Commander in Chief. The threats to America may change, but a president's willingness to confront them must be unwavering.

The world remains a dangerous place. Moreover, the dangers are now different and less apparent. So as we scale down our military, we must also keep up our guard. U.S. military strength will remain a force for stability -- and, yes, justice -- as the old global order continues to collapse and a new one emerges.

We can never forget this essential fact: power is the basis for successful diplomacy, and military power has always been fundamental to international relationships. So a president must provide the American people with a clear explanation of our enduring security interests, and a new estimate of the threats we are likely to face in the post Cold-War era. So far, in my judgment, this Administration has failed to supply that rationale. Failure to give a clear strategy for national security is fueling isolationism on both the left and the right.

Today there are two wrong-headed, dangerous approaches to adjusting our defenses for the new era. One is the Administration's. It talks of strategic change but simply shrinks the existing Cold War force structure. Continuation of this policy runs the risk of weakening the two elements that were key to our victory in the Gulf: our superbly trained and motivated personnel and our world-class weapons technology.

At the same time, there are those -- some in my party -- who see defense cuts largely as a piggy bank to fund their domestic wish lists, with our defense structures and missions as an afterthought, rather than a starting premise. This policy would also weaken our technological superiority and the quality and morale of our personnel.

Leadership demands more than a "Cold War Minus" or "Domestic Spending Plus." A president must identify the new threats to our security, define military missions to meet those threats, adapt our forces to carry out the missions, and back up those forces with the training, technology and intelligence they need to win.

We must start with a fresh assessment of the dangers that could threaten our interests and potentially require the use of force. These include: the risk of new threats from the former Soviet republics, should democracy fail; the spread of weapons of mass destruction; historic tensions in various regions, especially the Korean peninsula and the Middle East, and the related risks of terrorist attacks; and the growing intensity of ethnic, fundamentalist and separatist violence, as in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, that can spill across borders.

The mission of containing an expansionist Soviet Union has disappeared. But enduring missions remain: to maintain nuclear deterrence even as we reduce nuclear arsenals; to reassure our friends and democratic allies and discourage potential adversaries; to pursue our interests when possible through strengthened institutions of collective security; to preserve freedom on the high seas and protect our global economic interests; and to provide the superior technology and forces that are the ultimate guarantor of liberty.

House Armed Services Chair Les Aspin is right: The Administration's "base force" plan leaves us with a military that does not fit our strategy and cannot do what we ask. It is burdened with redundancy. Key parts lack flexibility and mobility. Just as you don't shoot gnats with a howitzer, we can't always respond rapidly and flexibly to far-flung regional conflicts with forces designed primarily for warfare in Europe. In other words, we must understand the new world's threats, not merely to decide how much force we need, but to design the right forces.

To lead and build effective coalitions, we must have the ability to operate on our own if necessary. We need to base a larger fraction of our forces in the U.S. and maintain a modern and well-equipped Navy and Marine Corps, so that we can project power wherever we need.

Our new military must be more mobile, because the new world will not simply be one of fixed flash points. We need the additional sealift that the Bush administration refused for so long to build. We also need the capabilities of the C-17 airlifter, which can fly long distances and then land on short fields close to the front.

Our new military must be more agile, because, with the end of the nuclear standoff, the new battlefields will likely be dominated by maneuver, speed, and outthinking the enemy. That is why, for example, I support a technology the Bush administration has tried to cancel -- the V-22 -- because it is the only aircraft capable of certain special operations, including the rescue of Americans held deep in hostile territory. And as House Intelligence Chair Dave McCurdy has said, we must have superior intelligence, to know where to apply force with best effect. We have seen in the last two years the price that a lack of intelligence can cause.

Our new military must be more precise and able to reduce casualties, because we may need to operate among civilian populations, and because the credibility of our threats to use force will often depend on our ability to limit the loss of life. We must upgrade the smart weapons that were so essential during Desert Storm, and develop new systems that can help reduce American and civilian casualties.

Our new military must be more flexible to operate with diverse partners, because in the new world coalition operations will often be important for political legitimacy. New friends

might be armed with former Warsaw Pact equipment, and new enemies armed with Western weapons. That is why we must find new ways to protect American and allied troops against the mistaken use of our own and allied weapons.

Our new military must be more ready, because the new world will be unpredictable. We must be ready in the future to reconstitute our forces if major new contingencies arise. And our new military must have deep roots in America, which is why it should make increased use of Guard and Reserve forces in regional contingencies, so that our use of force will be considered with the utmost seriousness, maintained affordably, and supported broadly at home.

In all, by shifting from a force designed to win the Cold War to one better equipped to respond rapidly to regional flare-ups, the Clinton-Gore defense budget brings savings of about \$60 billion over the current Bush plan through 1997, very close to the numbers of Senator Nunn and Representative Aspin. But our efforts must go further.

I agree with Senator Nunn that it is time to take a fresh look at the basic organization of our armed forces. We have four separate air forces -- one each for the Marines, Army, Navy and Air Force. Both the Army and Marines have light infantry divisions. The Navy and Air Force have separately-developed but similar fighter aircraft and tactical missiles. We have at least three and in some cases four separate Medical Corps, Chaplain Corps, Dental Corps, Legal Corps and Nursing Corps. Each service also has its own administrative, training and logistics facilities.

While respecting each service's unique capabilities, we can reduce redundancies, save billions of dollars, and get better teamwork. In 1948, then Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal convened a meeting of the military service chiefs in Key West to allocate responsibilities among the four services. It failed. As President, I will order the Pentagon to convene a similar meeting to hammer out a new understanding about consolidating and coordinating military roles and missions in the 1990s and beyond.

My Administration will make security and savings compatible. It will reduce our forces, but maintain a credible presence in Europe and Asia, and make reductions in consultation with our allies. We will stand up for our interests, but we will share burdens, where possible, through multilateral efforts to secure the peace, such as NATO and a new, voluntary U.N. Rapid Deployment Force. In Bosnia, Somalia, Cambodia, and other war-torn areas of the world, multilateral action holds promise as never before, and the U.N. deserves full and appropriate contributions from all the major powers. It is time for our friends to bear more of the burden.

Our new security strategy also will ensure our defense industry can supply the weapons and technologies America may need in the future. Again, I think this Administration lacks any such strategic sense. We are letting major production lines go cold, for everything from tanks to planes to submarines, often ignoring the capacities they represent.

We can't keep every production line and military lab open. But we must define the core skills and industries critical for America's security. We must eliminate needless military specifications that make defense production so unique, separate, and expensive. We will pursue new technologies with both civilian and defense uses. And we should also pursue anew a strong upgrade program to keep current lines operating and start limited production of next generation equipment.

We must not forget the American heroes of the Cold War whose lives will be turned upside down as our forces shrink. The Administration today has no serious plan to help our

defense workers and military personnel make a transition to a civilian economy. I have such a plan. For example, I support incentives for military personnel to earn military retirement by taking jobs as teachers and police, as Senator Nunn has suggested. I want to help retrain defense technicians for work in critical civilian fields such as bio-technology, renewable energy and environmental cleanup.

The Pentagon stands as America's best youth training program, our most potent research center and the most fully integrated institution in American life. It's time to put those assets to work at home. As Senator Nunn has suggested, there ought to be work for military forces and the National Guard in solving the problems of infrastructure, education, and rural health -- offering the possibility to our military personnel to serve as role models here at home, while all the while maintaining their consistent obligation to fulfill their primary military mission. The military engineering capacities, educational capacities, capacities for airlift of people in remote areas for health purposes, all of the things could be used to benefit us, here at home, to help us solve our problems, without weakening the military obligations of those who will be more stationed at home than the years ahead.

Finally, we cannot make America more secure unless we act against a host of new threats that don't respect national borders, such as terrorism, drug trafficking, and global environmental degradation. As Al Gore has so compellingly argued, the damage we do to the earth can be more than a threat to our health and resources; it can also aggravate international tensions and raise the chance of war itself.

One of the most dangerous new threats is the spread of military technology, especially weapons of mass destruction. We can't afford to wait until a host of Third World nations acquire full arsenals of First World weapons. We all saw the enormity of that threat as Scud missiles arced across the night skies of Israel and Saudi Arabia. We need to clamp down on countries and companies that sell proscribed technologies. Violators should be punished, and we must work urgently with all countries for tough, enforceable, non-proliferation agreements. We need better intelligence to identify at an earlier stage foreign nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons programs. We need to give informational nuclear inspectors the authority and means to make spot inspections. And a Clinton-Gore Administration will not permit American firms again to sell key technologies to outlaw states like Iraq.

The ultimate test of presidential leadership, of course, goes beyond defense budgets or battle plans. It is the judgment a president exercises in those perilous moments when countries are invaded, our friends are threatened, Americans are held hostage, and our nation's interests are on the line. When the American people choose a president, they want someone they can trust to act when those moments arise. Every president in the last half-century has had to confront the fateful decision to send Americans into combat. I do not relish this prospect, but neither do I shrink from it. I know we must have the resolve constantly to deter, sometimes to fight, always to win. That is why Al Gore and I supported the decision to use force to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. And why we stand united with President Bush in sending this message to Saddam as he flouts the U.N.'s resolutions: toe the line or face the music.

Conclusion

Whatever the threat or opportunity, national security is and must remain a bipartisan task. As a nation, we have many opinions, but only one foreign policy.

Yet presidential elections are about choices. And one of the choices the American people must make this year is about the kind of presidential leadership we want in a fundamentally new era. In this election, President Bush will seek to establish his leadership by emphasizing the time he has spent, the calls he has placed, and the trips he has taken in the conduct of foreign policy. But the measure of leadership in the new era is not the conversations held or the miles travelled. It is the new realities recognized, the crisis averted, the opportunities seized. I challenge him to set his vision of our nation's purpose in a dramatically new era against the one I am presenting in this campaign. For in the final analysis, we must have a president ready to think anew as the world is new.

Today's leadership is rudderless, reactive and erratic. It is time for leadership that is strategic, vigorous and grounded in America's democratic values.

In 1960, John F. Kennedy told America that there was "a new world to be won." Today there is again. My vision is of a world united in peaceful commerce; a world in which nations compete more in economic and less in military terms; a world of dynamic market-generated growth that narrows the gap between rich and poor; a world increasingly engaged in democracy, tolerant of diversity and respectful of human rights; a world united against the common enemies of mankind: war, poverty, ignorance, disease, and environmental destruction; a world we can pass on to our children and their children, with the knowledge that we rose to the new responsibilities of this new world and this new age.

I am running for President because I believe that a strong America -- strong in arms, strong in values, strong in wealth, strong in will -- remains the world's best of hope for turning that vision into a reality. Thank you.